

REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed June 27, 2005. Applicants appreciate the Examiner's consideration of the Application. Claims 4, 8, and 12 have been canceled, and Claims 1, 5, 9, and 13 have been amended to clarify, more particularly point out, and more distinctly claim inventive concepts previously present in these claims. Certain amendments do not narrow the scope of the claims, and certain amendments are not required for patentability. Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter has been added by the amendments to the claims. In order to advance prosecution of this Application, Applicants have responded to each notation by the Examiner. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

Objected to Claims

The Examiner indicated that Claims 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, and 12 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. (Office Action, page 3, paragraph 1.) Claims 1, 5, 9, and 13 have been amended to include the allowable subject matter of Claim 4, 8, or 12, and Claims 4, 8, and 12 have been canceled. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request removal of the objection to Claims 2, 6, and 10.

Section 103(a) Rejection

The Examiner rejects Claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13, and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,300,931 to Lindsay et al. ("Lindsay"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the reasons discussed below.

Claims 1, 5, 9, and 13 have been amended to include the allowable subject matter of Claim 4, 8, or 12, and Claim 14 includes the allowable subject matter of Claim 4. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request allowance of Claims 1, 5, 9, 13, and 14.

Applicants' dependent claims are allowable based on their dependence on the independent claims and further because they recite numerous additional patentable distinctions over the reference of the rejection. Because Applicants believe they have amply demonstrated the allowability of the independent claims over the reference of the rejection, and to avoid burdening the record, Applicants have not provided detailed remarks concerning these dependent claims. Applicants, however, remain ready to provide such remarks if it

becomes appropriate to do so. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the claims that depend on Claims 1, 5, 9, 13, and 14.

CONCLUSION

Applicants have made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully request full allowance of all the pending claims.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would advance prosecution of this case in any way, the Examiner is invited to contact Keiko Ichiye, the Attorney for Applicants, at the Examiner's convenience at (214) 953-6494.

Although Applicants believe no fees are due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of Baker Botts L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER BOTT S L.L.P.
Attorneys for Applicants



Keiko Ichiye
Reg. No. 45,460

Date: September 21, 2005

Correspondence Address:

Customer Number: 05073